arXiv:0804.2890v2 [gr-qc] 16 Oct 2008

How hot are expanding universes ?

Nathaniel Obadia[1]

[1]*École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, CRAL, UMR 5574 CNRS, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France*

A way to address the conundrum of Quantum Gravity is to illustrate the potentially fundamental interplay between quantum field theory, curved space-times physics and thermodynamics. So far, when studying moving quantum systems in the vacuum, the only known perfectly thermal temperatures are those obtained for constant (or null) accelerations A in constant (or null) Hubble parameters H space-times. In this Letter, restricting ourselves to conformally coupled scalar fields, we present the most comprehensive expression for the temperature undergone by a moving observer in the vacuum, valid for any time-dependent linear accelerations and Hubble parameters: $T = \sqrt{A^2 + H^2 + 2\dot{H}\dot{t}}/2\pi$ where $\dot{t} = \mathrm{d}t/\mathrm{d}\tau$ is the motion's Lorentz factor. The inequivalence between a constant T and actual thermality is explained. As a byproduct, all the Friedman universes for which observers at rest feel the vacuum as a thermal bath are listed.

Introduction– There are many ways to try to address the yet unknown issue of Quantum Gravity. One of them is to focus on physical situations that naturally involve quantum physics in curved space-time, like black holes (BH) or inflationary cosmology. The quantum treatment of these issues' outcome provides strong similarities with the basic laws of thermodynamics, mainly by assigning them a fixed temperature and, if any, a given entropy. This Letter attempts to go one step further in the study of thermodynamics applied to quantum mechanics in curved space-times.

Following Bekenstein's work on BH entropy[1], Hawking was the first one to assign an intrinsic temperature to a curved space-time issue by showing that BH quantum evaporation in the Minkowski vacuum is thermal[2] with $T_H = \kappa/2\pi$, $\kappa = 1/4M$ is the BH's *constant* surface gravity ($G = k_B = \hbar = 1$ henceforth). Understanding the analogy between BH and cosmological event horizons, Gibbons and Hawking[3] proposed that a similar temperature should be associated to de Sitter space-time too, $T_{GH} = H_0/2\pi$, where H_0 is the *constant* Hubble parameter. Transposing these intricate concepts to the safer ground of Minkowski space-time by invoking the equivalence principle, Unruh[4] showed that a similar temperature is attributed to uniformly accelerated world-lines in Minkowski space-time, $T_U = A_0/2\pi$, where A_0 is the world-line *constant* acceleration. Relating these two issues, Narnhofer *et al.*[5] demonstrated that such world-lines also exhibit a temperature in de Sitter space-time, $T_N = \sqrt{A_0^2 + H_0^2}/2\pi$, followed by Deser and Levin[6] who found the corresponding expression in the anti-de Sitter case. Several generalizations of these results have been achieved in the literature: While thermality in de Sitter space-time has been studied in [7] for massive and minimally coupled quanta in higher dimensions, Jacobson[8] replaced in the broader language of bifurcate Killing horizons Narnhofer *et al.*'s formula, and the latter has been generalized in [9] by introducing the concept of local temperatures.

The aim of this Letter is to broaden the mapping between thermodynamics and quantum field theory in curved space-times by proposing a general formula for temperatures of *time-dependent* $A[\tau]$ accelerated linear world-lines in *time-dependent* $H(t)$ Friedman-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker space-times for conformally coupled scalar fields. The method applied throughout this paper is the following: we focus on the two-point Wightman function W and identify thermality to when W takes a special form. From that, we infer a general formula for the temperature in the general case. We then explore known and new situations where thermality is obtained.

Friedman-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker space-times– Consider a FLRW universe with a flat metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \mathrm{d}t^2 - a^2(t)\left[\mathrm{d}x^2 + \mathrm{d}y^2 + \mathrm{d}z^2\right] . \qquad (1)$$

The conformal time is defined by $\mathrm{d}\eta = \mathrm{d}t/a(t)$ such that, with the conformal coordinates $(\eta, \vec{x})$, the metric reads $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = a^2(t(\eta))\,\mathrm{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$. Defining the Hubble parameter as $H = \partial_t a/a$ one gets

$$\eta(t) = \int_{t_1}^{t} \mathrm{d}l\; a(l)^{-1} + \eta_1 \;,\; a(t) = a_1 e^{\int_{t_1}^{t} \mathrm{d}l\; H(l)} \qquad (2)$$

where the subscript $_1$ denotes some reference time. The only non-vanishing affine connections are $\Gamma^0_{ii} = H(t)a(t)^2$ and $\Gamma^i_{i0} = \Gamma^i_{0i} = H(t)$. The Ricci tensor is diagonal $R_{tt} = 3H^2 + 3\partial_t H, R_{xx} = R_{yy} = R_{zz} = -(3H^2 + \partial_t H)a(t)^2$ and the curvature scalar is $R = 6(2H^2 + \partial_t H)$. In the sequel we shall use the property that no time-dependent H FLRW space-time can be obtained by a coordinate transformation from Minkowski ($H = 0$) or de Sitter ($H = H_0$)[24].

Wightman functions– The Lagrangian for a conformally coupled massless scalar field in a curved space-time background is given by

$$\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L} = -\sqrt{-g}\left(\frac{1}{2}g^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\mu \Phi)(\partial_\nu \Phi) - \frac{1}{12}R\Phi^2\right) . \qquad (3)$$

where $g = \det g_{\mu\nu}$. When using the rescaled field $\varphi = a\Phi$ one gets the d'Alembert equation $\left(\partial_\eta^2 - \Delta\right)\varphi = 0$ which enables to obtain the second quantized *physical* field

$$\Phi(t, \vec{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{a(t)} \int \mathrm{d}\vec{k}\; \left(b_{\vec{k}}\, \phi_{\vec{k}} + b^\dagger_{\vec{k}}\, \phi^*_{\vec{k}}\right) \qquad (4)$$

$$\phi_{\vec{k}} \;=\; e^{-i(k\eta(t)-\vec{k}\vec{x})}/\sqrt{2(2\pi)^3 k} \tag{5}$$

where $k = |\vec{k}|$; $b^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}$ and $b_{\vec{k}}$ are the creation and annihilation operators obeying the usual commutation rules $\left[b_{\vec{k}}, b^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}'}\right] = \delta(\vec{k}-\vec{k}')$. A key-tool to study the physics of the physical field Φ is the 2-point Wightman function

$$\begin{aligned} W(t,\vec{x};t',\vec{x'}) \;&=\; \langle 0|\Phi(t,\vec{x})\Phi(t',\vec{x'})|0\rangle \qquad (6)\\ &=\; \int \mathrm{d}\vec{k}\; \frac{e^{-i[k(\eta(t)-\eta(t'))-\vec{k}.(\vec{x}-\vec{x'})]}}{16\pi^3 k a(t) a(t')}\;. \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

This expression diverges as such in the ultra-violet and necessitates regularization[25]. Along this article the field will be compelled to lie along given time-like world-lines noted $x^{\mu}[\tau]$, where τ is the proper-time along the trajectory. When labelling both events $(t,\vec{x};t',\vec{x'})$ by their proper-times τ and τ', a convenient procedure to regularize Eq.(7) consists in shifting the labels in the complex plane according to [11] $\tau \to \tau - i\xi, \tau' \to \tau' + i\xi$; $\xi > 0$ being a small parameter sent to zero at the end of the calculation. The presence and the sign of $i\xi$ are mandatory to obtain the following regular results:

$$\begin{aligned} W[\tau,\tau'] \;=\; -\Big[4\pi^2\big\{(\eta(t[\tau-i\xi]) - \eta(t[\tau'+i\xi]))^2 \qquad (8)\\ -(\vec{x}[\tau-i\xi]-\vec{x}[\tau'+i\xi])^2\big\}\, a(t[\tau])\, a(t[\tau'])\Big]^{-1}\;. \end{aligned}$$

When restricting ourselves to linear trajectories $x^{\mu}[\tau] = (t[\tau],0,0,z[\tau])$, the Wightman function reads

$$\begin{aligned} W[\tau,\tau'] \;&=\; \frac{-1}{4\pi^2}\left[\left(\int_{t[\tau'+i\xi]}^{t[\tau-i\xi]} \mathrm{d}u\; P[u;\tau,\tau']\right)^2\right. \qquad (9)\\ &\quad \left.-\;\left(\int_{t[\tau'+i\xi]}^{t[\tau-i\xi]} \mathrm{d}u\; \beta(u) P[u;\tau,\tau']\right)^2\right]^{-1}\\ &=\; \frac{-1}{4\pi^2}\left[\left(\int_{-(\delta-i\xi)}^{\delta-i\xi} \mathrm{d}\lambda\; \dot{t}[\bar{\tau}+\lambda] Q[\lambda;\bar{\tau},\delta]\right)^2\right. \qquad (10)\\ &\quad \left.-\;\left(\int_{-(\delta-i\xi)}^{\delta-i\xi} \mathrm{d}\lambda\; \sqrt{\dot{t}[\bar{\tau}+\lambda]^2-1}\; Q[\lambda;\bar{\tau},\delta]\right)^2\right]^{-1}\\ P[u;\tau,\tau'] \;&=\; e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int_{t[\tau]}^{u}\mathrm{d}l\; H(l) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{t[\tau']}^{u}\mathrm{d}l\; H(l)}\\ Q[\lambda;\bar{\tau},\delta] \;&=\; e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\delta}^{\lambda}\mathrm{d}\sigma\; \dot{t}[\bar{\tau}+\sigma] H(t[\bar{\tau}+\sigma]) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\delta}^{\lambda}\mathrm{d}\sigma\; \dot{t}[\bar{\tau}+\sigma] H(t[\bar{\tau}+\sigma])} \end{aligned}$$

where $\dot{} = \partial_{\tau}$, $\delta = (\tau-\tau')/2$, $\bar{\tau} = (\tau+\tau')/2$ and $0 \le \beta(t[\tau]) = \frac{\sqrt{\dot{t}^2-1}}{\dot{t}} < 1$. The Wightman function only depends on the values of H and of the trajectory between τ' and τ: this is the signature of causality. Note also that the integrals do not vanish when the two events coincide, thanks to the regulator $i\xi$: regulating the ultraviolet divergence for the modes in Eq.(7) is equivalent to avoiding the small lapse singularity in Eqs.(9) and (10). Moreover, although the definition (6) trivially ensures $W[\tau,\tau'] = W[\tau',\tau]^*$ with or without regulator, the latter causes the inequality $W[\tau,\tau'] \neq W[\tau',\tau]$ which encodes the fact the vacuum contains only positive frequency modes. Finally, Eq.(10) shows that the regulation reduces to the mere shift $\delta \to \delta - i\xi$. Keeping this in mind, we omit $i\xi$ in the sequel for the sake of clarity.

From Eqs.(9) and (10), the Wightman function is written as a functional of $H(t)$ and $\dot{t}[\tau]$, since $\dot{z} = e^{-\int^{t}\mathrm{d}l\; H(l)}\sqrt{\dot{t}^2-1}$. More useful is to consider the acceleration along the world-line which square is

$$A^2[\tau] \;=\; -g_{\mu\nu}\frac{\mathrm{D}\dot{x}^{\mu}}{\mathrm{D}\tau}\frac{\mathrm{D}\dot{x}^{\nu}}{\mathrm{D}\tau} \tag{11}$$

where D is the covariant derivative for any 4−vector B^{μ} $\frac{\mathrm{D}B^{\mu}}{\mathrm{D}\tau} \equiv \frac{\mathrm{d}B^{\mu}}{\mathrm{d}\tau} + \Gamma^{\mu}_{\alpha\beta}B^{\alpha}\dot{x}^{\beta}$ and $g_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} = 1$. For linear trajectories one obtains

$$A[\tau] = \ddot{t}/\sqrt{\dot{t}^2-1} + H(t)\sqrt{\dot{t}^2-1} \tag{12}$$

when $\dot{t} \neq 1$; and $A = 0$ when $\dot{t} = 1$. The acceleration in FLRW space-times comes from two sources: the first term in Eq.(12) is the extrinsic part inherent to the sole trajectory's acceleration whereas the second one is the intrinsic part due to the universe's expansion. The special case $\dot{t} = \gamma = cst > 1$, that we call "gliding" trajectories because their acceleration comes only from the universe's one, possess the very simple $A[\tau] = H(\gamma\tau)\sqrt{\gamma^2-1}$.

The Minkowski case/Thermality– When studying linear trajectories in Minkowski space-time, the Wightman function's Taylor development around $\delta = 0$ involves the acceleration $A_M[\tau] = \ddot{t}/\sqrt{\dot{t}^2-1}$ according to[11]

$$\begin{aligned} W[\bar{\tau}+\delta,\bar{\tau}-\delta] \;&=\; -\left(4\pi^2 d^2[\bar{\tau}+\delta,\bar{\tau}-\delta]\right)^{-1} \qquad (13)\\ d^2[\bar{\tau}+\delta,\bar{\tau}-\delta] \;&=\; 4\delta^2 + \frac{4}{3}\delta^4\; A_M^2[\bar{\tau}] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^6) \qquad (14)\end{aligned}$$

where d is the geodesic distance between both events and where the last term in Eq.(14) is *a priori* also a function of $\bar{\tau}$. Although it is not trivially deduced from the previous equations, the condition $A_M = cst$ is *equivalent* to $W[\delta]$ only. In other words, inertial ($\dot{t} = \gamma \ge 1, A_M = 0$) and uniformly accelerated ($\dot{t} = \cosh[A_0\tau], A_M = A_0$) linear trajectories are the only stationary linear world-lines in Minkowski space[12]:

$$\begin{aligned} W_M^{in}[\bar{\tau}+\delta,\bar{\tau}-\delta] \;&=\; -\left(4\pi\delta\right)^{-2} \qquad (15)\\ W_M^{u.acc}[\bar{\tau}+\delta,\bar{\tau}-\delta;A_0] \;&=\; -\left(4\pi\sinh\left[A_0\delta\right]/A_0\right)^{-2} \qquad (16)\end{aligned}$$

Eq.(16) happens to be also the Wightman function along an inertial world-line in a thermal bath at temperature

$$T_U = A_0/2\pi\;. \tag{17}$$

This result, the Unruh effect[4], induces that uniformly accelerated observers in the Minkowski vacuum feel as embedded in a thermal bath. It is crucial to notice that the thermality and the value of the temperature itself are univocally defined by the functional structure of the Wightman function (16), *i.e.* its stationary character and its hyperbolic sine functional dependence in δ. Though useful tools, two-level detectors[11], mirrors[13, 14] or other quantum devices[15] are not mandatory to reveal thermality: *Thermality is equivalent to a Wightman function that can be written as Eq.(16).*

The general case– Using Eq.(10), one finds that, for any linear trajectory in any FLRW universe,

$$W[\bar\tau+\delta,\bar\tau-\delta] = -\left(4\pi^2 D[\bar\tau+\delta,\bar\tau-\delta]\right)^{-1} \quad (18)$$

$$D[\bar\tau+\delta,\bar\tau-\delta] = 4\delta^2 + \frac{4}{3}\delta^4\ B[\bar\tau] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^6) \quad (19)$$

$$B[\tau] = A^2 + H^2 + 2\partial_t H\dot t^2 = A^2 + H^2 + 2\dot H \dot t\ . \quad (20)$$

A priori B is neither constant nor even positive. If one requires a *stationary* Wightman function, a uniform B is a *necessary* condition. Moreover, if one requires a *thermal* Wightman function, *i.e.* the hyperbolic sine dependence (16), a positive B is another *necessary* condition. Therefore, thermality implies that the temperature should take the value $\sqrt{B}/2\pi$ as $A_M/2\pi = A_0/2\pi$ in Eqs.(14) and (17). Hence the following theorem:

In a flat FLRW space-time given by its Hubble parameter $H(t)$, if a linearly moving observer with acceleration $A[\tau]$ feels the vacuum as a thermal bath, the Wightman function along the world-line is equal to[26]

$$W[\bar\tau+\delta,\bar\tau-\delta] = -\left(4\pi \sinh\left[2\pi T_{eff}\delta\right]/2\pi T_{eff}\right)^{-2} \quad (21)$$

and the corresponding (constant) temperature is[27]

$$T_{eff} = \sqrt{A^2 + H^2 + 2\partial_t H \dot t^2}/2\pi\ . \quad (22)$$

Let us fathom this result in the well-known de Sitter case and then extend its applicability to other space-times.

The de Sitter case– When considering de Sitter space-time ($H(t) = H_0$), $T_{eff} = cst$ implies either inertial or uniformly accelerated linear trajectories. Inertial trajectories are either the static solution $\dot t = 1$ or the extrinsically counter-accelerating one $\dot t = 1/\tanh[H_0(\tau-\tau_0)]$, defined for $\tau > \tau_0$. Considering these two types of inertial world-lines, one gets

$$W^{in}_{dS}[\tau,\tau';H_0] = -\left(4\pi\sinh\left[H_0\delta\right]/H_0\right)^{-2}\ . \quad (23)$$

The latter expression is exactly the Wightman function obtained for uniformly accelerating trajectories in Minkowski space-time with $A_M = H_0$ (16). The equivalence between both situations finds its roots in the fact that $3+1$ de Sitter can be seen as a time-like hyperboloid, parametrized by its radius $1/H_0$, embedded in 4+1 Minkowski space-time. The geodesics in the first one are homomorphic to uniformly accelerated world-lines in the second one with $A_M = H_0$. From this analogy, one recovers the Gibbons-Hawking's temperature[3]

$$T^{in}_{dS} = T_{eff} = H_0/2\pi\ . \quad (24)$$

Uniformly accelerated world-lines in de Sitter are obtained, for example, with the gliding trajectories ($A_G = H_0\sqrt{\gamma^2-1}$). The Wightman function is also thermal

$$W^{u.acc}_{dS}[\tau,\tau';H_0;\gamma] = -\left(4\pi\sinh\left[H_0\gamma\delta\right]/(H_0\gamma)\right)^{-2} \quad (25)$$

with the Narnhofer *et al.* temperature[5]

$$T^{u.acc}_{dS} = T_{eff} = H_0\gamma/2\pi = \sqrt{A_G^2 + H_0^2}/2\pi\ . \quad (26)$$

Other thermal cases– Our method to look for other solutions is to impose the necessary condition $B[\tau] = cst \geq 0$ and to fix one degree of freedom (either the cosmology $H(t)$ or the trajectory $\dot t[\tau]$). Once a possible solution is found, if the Wightman obeys Eq.(21), one deduces thermality with the temperature (22).

First let us look for cases for which the vacuum appears as an effective one, *i.e.* $T_{eff} = 0$. Apart from the trivial case (15), Eq.(20) requires the Hubble parameter to be a strictly decreasing function of time and to satisfy

$$B[\tau] \equiv (H^2 + 2\partial_t H)\dot t^2 + 2H\ddot t + \frac{\ddot t^2}{\dot t^2 - 1} = 0\ . \quad (27)$$

Therefore all the gliding trajectories $t = \gamma\tau$, including the inertial ones ($\gamma = 1$), have $A[\tau] = 2\sqrt{\gamma^2-1}/\tau$, and possess a vanishing effective temperature *iff* $H^2 + 2\partial_t H = 0 \Leftrightarrow H(t) = H_W(t) = 2/(t-t_0)$. This Hubble parameter is a specific example of power-law inflation[16] with the equation of state $\omega = -2/3$ and emerges as a solution for a wall-dominated phase[17]. Moreover, if one restricts oneself to $t > t_1 \gtrsim t_0$, H_W is a viable model of non-slow-rolling transition from a large Hubble factor $H_W(t_1)$ universe to an asymptotically vanishing curvature one. One can easily check with Eq.(10) that $t = \gamma\tau$ gives back the same Wightman function as in the Minkowski/inertial case (15): when $H(t) = H_W(t)$, inertial trajectories ($A = 0$), as well as gliding ones ($A \propto 1/\tau$), feel the vacuum as an effective one as they do in Minkowski space

$$H_W(t) = 2/(t-t_0) \Rightarrow T^{in}_W = T^G_W = T_{eff} = 0\ . \quad (28)$$

Note however that gliding trajectories are accelerated in this universe contrary to Minkowski space. Remark also that, though Wightman functions *for these trajectories* are equivalent in both space-times, Minkowski and H_W-FLRW universes differ since no coordinate transformation can bring one to the other. In the sequel we give an example that explicitly splits the degeneracy between both space-times.

Contrary to the previous example, requiring non-zero temperatures allows also non-decreasing Hubble parameters solutions. Focusing on inertial and gliding trajectories, $\dot{B} = 2\gamma^3(H\partial_t H + \partial_t^2 H) = 0$ has for only non-trivial solutions the family of functions

$$H_P(t) = H_0 \tanh(H_0(t - t_0)/2) \qquad (29)$$

where t_0 and H_0 are free parameters. Since H_P is always increasing it is a typical example of phantom cosmology[18] for which the equation of state is time-dependent $\omega = -1 - \sinh^2[H_0(t - t_0)/2]/2 < -1$. It describes a contracting and bouncing back space-time that possesses de Sitter as an attractor and can be obtained with a conformally coupled massive inflaton with a $\lambda\varphi^4$ potential[19]. This model could be used, for instance, to describe the onset of near-de Sitter inflation by some other mechanism. Plugging this solution into Eq.(9) one obtains a similar result as previously for inertial and gliding trajectories though this time involving an equivalence with de Sitter

$$\begin{aligned} W^{in}_{H_P}[\tau, \tau'; H_0] &= W^{in}_{dS}[\tau, \tau'; H_0] &(30)\\ W^{G}_{H_P}[\tau, \tau'; H_0, t_0; \gamma] &= W^{u.acc}_{dS}[\tau, \tau'; H_0; \gamma] &(31)\end{aligned}$$

which means that, although the Hubble parameter depends on time, inertial and gliding observers in a $H_P(t; H_0, t_0)$ cosmology feel the vacuum as if they were imbedded in a H_0 de Sitter space:

$$T^{in}_{H_P} = T_{eff} = H_0/2\pi \ , \ T^{G}_{H_P} = T_{eff} = H_0\gamma/2\pi \ . \qquad (32)$$

Since in H_P space gliding trajectories do not possess a uniform acceleration as they do in de Sitter, the similarity between both space-times is not perfect, once again.

As a byproduct of the last paragraphs, one learns that, using the subgroup of $\dot{t} = 1$ inertial world-lines, two other FLRW universes possess an intrinsic temperature (*i.e.* related to inertial trajectories) besides Minkowski and de Sitter: $H_W(t)$ with $T^{in}_{eff} = 0$, and $H_P(t; H_0)$ with $T^{in}_{eff} = H_0/2\pi$. Considering $\dot{t} \neq 1$ inertial world-lines, can other space-times be intrinsically thermal ? The reparametrization $\dot{t}[\tau] = 1/\tanh(\alpha[\tau]) > 1$ in Eq.(12), provides all the other solutions

$$H[\tau] = \dot{\alpha} \ , \ T^{in}_{eff} = \sqrt{\dot{\alpha}^2 + 2\ddot{\alpha}/\tanh\alpha}/2\pi \ . \qquad (33)$$

Injecting the latter quantities in Eq.(10) and imposing $B = 4\pi^2 T^2_{eff} = cst$, the δ^6 term in Eq.(19) is $(8/45)(B^2 - (B - \dot{\alpha}^2)^2/4\cosh^2\alpha)$ instead of the $8B^2/45$ an hyperbolic sine provides: Minkowski ($H = \dot{\alpha} = \sqrt{B} = 0$) and de Sitter ($H = \dot{\alpha} = \sqrt{B} \neq 0$) with the trajectory quoted above Eq.(23) are the only solutions. *Hence the only intrinsically thermal FLRW space-times are Minkowski, H_W, de Sitter and H_P.*

Necessary but not sufficient– The trajectory $\dot{t}[\tau] = \cosh[A_0\tau]$, which provides thermality in Minkowski space-time, possesses a uniform acceleration $A = 3A_0$ and a constant $T_{eff} = \sqrt{5}A_0/2\pi$ when $H = H_W$. However, the corresponding Wightman function is not stationary and not thermal. The latter result shows that, though necessary, $T_{eff} = cst$ is not sufficient to claim for thermality; this should not be a surprise. In [11], it has been shown that only in the particular case of *linear* trajectories in *Minkowski* space-time, a constant acceleration is equivalent to a thermal Wightman function. As soon as $2D$-exploring trajectories are concerned this equivalence is broken though Eqs(13) and (14) are still valid. a) For instance see the cusp motion which exact expression generates the "circular Unruh effect"[20, 21]: there, a constant acceleration A_0 provides a stationary but *non-thermal* Wightman function. When using two-level detectors, two quasi-temperatures are found according to the probed part of the spectrum, but neither one nor the other equals $A_0/2\pi$. b) More drastic than the former example, any uniform acceleration but time-dependent torsion planar world-line is non-stationary[11]. Therefore, adding one degree of freedom breaks the implication $T_{eff} = cst \Rightarrow$ *thermality*, whether T_{eff} is a perfect or even a quasi-temperature. With this respect, the expansion caused by the Hubble factor acts as an additional degree of freedom and has the same side-effect.

Summary– In this Letter the concept of "temperature of a moving observer in a curved space-time vacuum" is extended to all time-dependent Hubble parameters and linear accelerations for conformally coupled fields: If the vacuum is felt as a thermal bath along a world-line in a given FLRW space-time, its temperature is T_{eff} given in Eq.(22). As a general law for such systems, *thermality* **T** always implies *stationarity* **S**. Here we found that, if **T** naturally requires T_{eff} to be constant, the inverse implication is not true. This is rooted in the fact that, as was found for (hyper-)torsion for some non-linear(non-planar) world-lines[11, 12], there is more than one degree of freedom in the problem: in our case, due to the non-linear differential character of the Wightman function that entangles A, H, *etc*, the curvature of space-time prevents **S** $\Rightarrow$ **T** to be always true. Moreover, neither **S** nor **T** are equivalent to $\dot{H} = 0$, as is epitomized in the second result of this letter: two $H(t)$ space-times, Eqs.(28) and (29), are intrinsically thermal, *i.e.* for observers at rest. Though significatively time-dependent[28], these space-times share their thermal properties with their respective attractors, Minkowski and de Sitter, thereby allowing an isothermal transition to them. In order to interpret where isothermality is rooted, one has to find the physical cause of similar Green functions either by referring directly to the space-times Killing properties[8] or by invoking common causal horizons characteristics[22]; this is the subject of a work in progress[23]. Another question this Letter raises is what happens for "real" universes, for which the Hubble parameter is not exactly constant or equal to Eqs.(28) and (29); that is whether or not quasi-thermality is achievable for slowly varying

T_{eff} (as was done for near-uniform acceleration worldlines in Minkowski space[11])[23]. A better understanding of these issues will help to unveil the foundations of Quantum Gravity by exploring the intricacy of its thermodynamics.

Acknowledgements I thank M.Milgrom, B.D.Bruner and an anonymous referee for very helpful remarks as well as the CIMeC, Trento U. for their hospitality.

[1] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973).
[2] S. W. Hawking, Nature **258**, 30 (1974).
[3] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2738 (1977).
[4] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).
[5] H. Narnhofer, I. Peter and W. Thirring, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B10**, 1507 (1996).
[6] S. Deser and O. Levin, Class. Quant. Grav. **14**, L163 (1997).
[7] B. Garbrecht and T. Prokopec, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 4993 (2004).
[8] T. Jacobson, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 251 (1998).
[9] D. Buchholz and J. Schlemmer, Class. Quant. Grav. **24**, F25 (2007).
[10] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman and Company (1973).
[11] N. Obadia and M. Milgrom, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 065006 (2007).
[12] J. R. Letaw, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1709 (1981).
[13] N. Obadia and R. Parentani, Phys. Rev. D. **67**, 024021 (2003).
[14] N. Obadia and R. Parentani, Phys. Rev. D. **67**, 024022 (2003).
[15] An extensive study of the Unruh effect can be found in L. C. B. Crispino, A. Higuchi and G. E. A. Matsas, arXiv:0710.5373 [gr-qc].
[16] F. Lucchin and S. Matarrese, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 1316 (1985).
[17] D. Seckel, Fermilab Rep. 84-092-A, (1984) unpublished.
[18] R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Lett. B **545**, 23 (2002).
[19] V. Faraoni, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 471 (2002).
[20] J.S.Bell and J.M.Leinaas, Nucl. Phys. **B212**, 131 (1983).
[21] W. G. Unruh, *Phys. Rept.* **307**, 163 (1998).
[22] T. Jacobson and R. Parentani, Found. Phys. **33**, 323 (2003).
[23] N. Obadia, works in progress.
[24] This comes from the fact that maximally symmetric spaces in $3+1$ dimensions exhibit[10] $R_{\mu\nu} = (R/4)g_{\mu\nu}$, which is only achieved by Minkowski and de Sitter among FLRW flat space-times.
[25] More than its regularizability, the mere existence of the formula (7) comes from the joined conditions of a) using a FLRW geometry in which constant time slices are conformally flat and b) restricting ourselves to conformally coupled fields.
[26] One could ask why thermality cannot be achieved by adding in the r.h.s of Eq.(21) a suitable "reminder" (that would not alter the thermal response function of a detector, for instance). By subtracting Eq.(21) to Eq.(18), one finds that this reminder should be at least $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$. However, if one wishes to recover a Planck ratio for the excited and ground levels of a detector moving along the trajectory, the reminder should be at least $\mathcal{O}((\delta - i\epsilon)^{-4})$[11]. Therefore, no reminder can be added and thermality has to be defined by the strict equality Eq.(21).
[27] As it should be, Eq.(22) possesses a covariant rewriting: H and $\partial_t H$ are functions of R and $R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}$, and $\dot{t} = \dot{H}/\partial_t H$.
[28] Their first slow-roll parameters are $\epsilon_W = 1/2$ and the unbounded $\epsilon_P = -(\cosh(H_0(t-t_0)) - 1)^{-1}$.